

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION

Demario Clyburn,)
Plaintiff,) C/A No. 2:13-742-TMC
v.)
Lt. Tonya Huntley,)
Defendant.)

ORDER

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge Bruce Howe Hendricks made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina (“Report”).

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections are made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation, or recommit the matter with instructions. *See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)*.

Magistrate Judge Hendricks recommends the action be dismissed for failure to prosecute. (ECF No. 26). No objection has been filed to the Magistrate Judge’s Report.

In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 26) and incorporates it herein. It appears the Plaintiff no longer wishes to prosecute this action. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the action is **DISMISSED** with prejudice for failure to prosecute pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 41(b). It is further **ORDERED** that the Defendant's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 19) is **DENIED** as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Timothy M. Cain
United States District Judge

Anderson, South Carolina
September 12, 2013

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.